

Headquarters U.S. Air Force

Integrity - Service - Excellence

AFFARS Rewrite Source Selection



July
2004



U.S. AIR FORCE

Goals



- Address issues with source selection processes identified by field and HQ personnel
- Ensure the source selection processes provide the right balance of flexibility and standardization across the breadth of Air Force source selections
- Determine whether recent experiments associated with the source selection process should be incorporated into policy, procedure, or guidance
- Change flow of procedures to better reflect actual flow of events
 - More helpful for source selection novice



U.S. AIR FORCE

New Format



■ Revised AFFARS

- Two deviations to FAR (discussed below)
 - Definition of Deficiency clarified for AF source selections
 - SSA to establish competitive range
- Applicable to all source selections
 - Basic-Median-Agency terminology removed
- Establishes Mandatory Procedures (MP) & Informational Guidance (IG)

■ New Mandatory Procedures & Informational Guidance

- Moved procedural language from AFFARS to MP
- Improves readability
- IG incorporated into the MP via highlighted info or endnotes
 - IG consists of discussions, lessons learned, best practices, etc
- Hyperlinks to associated statutes, regulations, and other IG provided



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Ensure source selection process provides the right balance of flexibility and standardization
 - Eliminate Basic/Median/Agency structure
 - Retained existing requirements in MP5315.3
 - SSSR <\$10M, PAR >\$100M, SSA choice between
 - Proposal Risk Required >\$10M
 - CO is SSA <\$10M
 - SSET & SSAC are established by SSA
 - Changed
 - Performance Confidence Assessment Group (PCAG, formerly PRAG) chair appointed by SSET chair or SSA (now SSA)
 - PCAG required >\$100M, else optional (now optional)
 - Eliminated requirement for higher level approval for more than 2 members on team when <\$10M



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Ensure source selection process provides the right balance of flexibility and standardization (continued)
 - Applicability and exemptions
 - AFFARS – no exemptions (AFFARS 5315.001-5315.3)
 - Specifies SSA, use of non-government personnel, FAR deviations
 - Mandatory Procedures (MP5315.3)
 - Retained S&T, A&E exemptions -- unique processes prescribed by statute or higher level regulation
 - LPTA and PPT continue to be exempt
 - Changed <SAT exemption to <\$1M or SAP, whichever is greater
 - Exempted teams
 - May use MP5315.3 as a guide
 - Must follow FAR, DFARS, and AFFARS requirements
 - Now have flexibility to address other factors in simple acquisitions, e.g., schedule



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Ensure source selection process provides the right balance of flexibility and standardization (continued)
 - Allow MAJCOMS to develop alternative processes/factors for classes of acquisitions
 - ➔ Examples: AFMC procedures for S&T, Spares; Schedule/Price trade-off
 - Tailoring by SSA not permitted, use deviation IAW AFFARS 5301.4
 - SSET & SSAC may make recommendation(s) only when requested



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Ensure source selection process provides the right balance of flexibility and standardization (continued)
 - Use of non-government advisors and evaluators
 - ➔ FFRDC -- May serve on SSET and SSAC as member or advisor
 - ➔ Other non-government personnel may be advisors only, with special rules
 - ➔ Changed required action if offeror objects to use of non-government personnel
 - Reallocated responsibilities
 - ➔ Ensure consistent membership -- from CO to SSA
 - ➔ Proper and efficient conduct of SS process -- from SSET to SSA
 - ➔ Knowledge of Standards of Conduct and signing of briefing certificate moved -- from SSET to SSA
 - ➔ CO as “business advisor” references -- to Informational Guidance



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Address recent issues with source selection process identified by field and HQ personnel
 - Basis of Award and Evaluation Criteria
 - ➔ Changed language from warrior needs to requirements
 - ➔ Ties evaluation criteria, instructions to offerors, and risk analysis
 - Require consideration of a risk assessment
 - SSA establishes competitive range – FAR deviation
 - ➔ Current language indicates SSA approves elimination of any offeror before CO established competitive range—eliminates confusion



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Address recent issues with source selection process identified by field and HQ personnel (continued)
 - Require use of 4 std factors for full trade-off Source Selections: Mission Capability, Proposal Risk (optional if <\$10M), Past Performance, and Price/Cost – no change
 - The use of std definitions for MC, PR, and PP – added clarifying language and definitions
 - Deleted AF unique Cost/Price definitions & instructions—Referenced FAR & DFAR guidance



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Address recent issues with source selection process identified by field and HQ personnel (continued)
 - Mission Capability Changes and Clarifications
 - Clarification of Strengths as they relate to Green and Blue ratings
 - One or more strengths are needed for “blue”; but may have one or more strengths and be green
 - “Blue” related to additional benefit of strength to government
 - Eliminated Proposal Inadequacy – problematic during evaluations
 - Retain Yellow primarily as interim rating
 - Clarification of Deficiencies as they relate to Red ratings
 - Six sub-factors, can increase with justification
 - Removed references to Elements
 - AQ guidance re systems engineering (SE) – Subfactor in ACAT and in “other contracting” if SE effort required. Must justify not using in ACAT
 - Point toward rather than away from Small Business considerations



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Address recent issues with source selection process identified by field and HQ personnel (continued)
 - Elimination of risk-related Deficiencies (deviation from FAR definition of deficiency)
 - “Deficiency” is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement -- **DELETED -- or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level**
 - AF assesses proposal risk as separate factor -- FAR definition confusing
 - Past Performance Clarifications
 - Elimination of dual rating names -- more in line with DoD PP guide
 - Removed “risk” wording – adopted “confidence” language (see notes)
 - Discussed concept of relevancy, but did not define relevancy for PP evaluation – referred to AF PP guide



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Issues We Considered



- Determine if and how recent "experiments" associated with source selection process should be incorporated into policy and/or guide
 - Declaration of Competitive Range at RFP release to allow immediate discussions – Not addressed (Policy Unchanged)
 - Delegate authority to release ENs and begin discussions from SSA to SSET chairperson if no offeror is eliminated from competitive range– Change: SSA may delegate to **CO**
 - Establish process to allow offerors direct access to SSAC members and SSA to ensure fairness and adequate communications have taken place – Not addressed (Policy Unchanged)
 - Expand requirement to release ratings at key points in process to all source selections – Required: Offerors informed of ratings, etc at beginning and conclusion of discussions



U.S. AIR FORCE

Changes to Past Performance Terminology



FROM: TO:

Exceptional/High Confidence

HIGH CONFIDENCE.

Very Good/Significant Confidence

SIGNIFICANT CONFIDENCE

Satisfactory/Confidence

SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE

Neutral/Unknown Confidence

UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE

Marginal/Little Confidence

LITTLE CONFIDENCE

Unsatisfactory/No Confidence

NO CONFIDENCE

From: Exceptional/High Confidence Based on the offeror's performance record, essentially no doubt exists that the

offeror will successfully perform the required effort

To: HIGH CONFIDENCE Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has high confidence the offeror will successfully perform the required effort

From: Very Good/Significant Confidence Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt the offeror will

successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements

To: SIGNIFICANT CONFIDENCE Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has significant confidence the offeror will successfully perform the required effort



U.S. AIR FORCE

Changes to Past Performance Terminology (continued)



From: Satisfactory/Confidence
offeror will

To: SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE
confidence the

emphasis

Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the

successfully perform the required effort

Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has

offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Normal contractor

should preclude any problems

From: Marginal/Little Confidence
will

processes

To: LITTLE CONFIDENCE
the offeror

Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt the offeror

successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the offeror's existing

may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements

Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that

will successfully perform the required effort



U.S. AIR FORCE

Changes to Mission Capability Terminology



From:

- Blue – Exceptional -- Exceeds specified minimum performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the Air Force
- Green – Acceptable -- Meets specified minimum performance or capability requirements necessary for acceptable contract performance
- Yellow – Marginal -- Does not clearly meet some specified minimum performance or capability requirements necessary for acceptable contract performance, but any proposal inadequacies are correctable
- Red – Unacceptable -- Fails to meet specified minimum performance or capability requirements. Proposals with an unacceptable rating are not awardable

To:

- Blue – Exceptional -- Exceeds specified minimum performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the government; **proposal must have one or more strengths and no deficiencies to receive a blue**
- Green – Acceptable -- Meets specified minimum performance or capability requirements delineated in the Request for Proposal; **proposal rated green must have no deficiencies but may have one or more strengths**
- Yellow – Marginal -- Does not clearly meet some specified minimum performance or capability requirements delineated in the Request for Proposal, but any such uncertainty is correctable
- Red – Unacceptable -- Fails to meet specified minimum performance or capability requirements; **proposal has one or more deficiencies.** Proposals with an unacceptable rating are not awardable



U.S. AIR FORCE

Definitions



- The use of std definitions for MC, PR, and PP and added clarifying language (all new):
 - **Mission Capability.** The mission capability evaluation provides an assessment of the offeror's capability to satisfy the government's requirements
 - **Proposal Risk.** The proposal risk evaluation factor assesses the risk that the offeror's proposed approach for the requirements of the solicitation will cause significant disruption of schedule, increased costs, or degraded performance
 - **Past Performance.** The past performance evaluation factor assesses the degree of confidence the government has in an offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet users' needs, including cost and schedule, based on a demonstrated record of performance
- Added Definitions:
 - "Mission Capability" expresses evaluation criteria that address technical, performance, or capability requirements
 - "Proposal Risk" is an evaluation of the likelihood or risk that the offeror's proposed approach to meeting the requirements of the solicitation will cause significant disruption of schedule, increased costs, or degraded performance
 - "Performance Confidence Assessment" is an evaluation of the likelihood (or government's confidence) that the offeror will successfully complete the solicitation's requirements; the evaluation is based upon past performance



U.S. AIR FORCE

FAR Deviations



■ Definition of Deficiency

- FAR -- "Deficiency" is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level
- AFFAR -- "Deficiency" is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement
- AF considers proposal risk as a separate factor

■ Establishment of Competitive Range

- FAR – ... the contracting officer shall establish a competitive range ...
- AFFAR -- The Source Selection Authority shall establish the competitive range
- Desired by leadership & cleaned process...